

REMARKS

The Examiner's comments from the office action mailed April 13, 2007 have been carefully considered. Claims 1-27 remain pending in the application. Amendments have been made to claims 1, 2, 4, 14, and 27. Support for these revisions can be found throughout the specification, e.g., in paragraphs 31, 36, 79, and in FIGS. 4A, 4B, and 5. No new matter has been added.

Applicants are filing a Request for Continued Examination herewith. Reexamination and allowance of claims 1-27 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-5, 14-18, and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) under U.S. Patent No. 7,171,443 to Tiemann et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,226 to Tso et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, creating a page object on a server including determining whether each object referenced by the page object corresponds to a user control; determining whether each user control supports output caching; and determining whether the object referenced by the page object is cached if the object corresponds to a user control that supports output caching.

In contrast, the combination of Tiemann and Tso fails to disclose or suggest determining whether each object referenced by the page object corresponds to a user control. Furthermore, none of the cited references discloses determining whether each user control supports output caching. Neither Tiemann nor Tso distinguish between objects that support output caching and objects that do not support output caching.

Tiemann discloses receiving at a client dynamic content from a server; determining whether static content is available locally at the client; and requesting any static content that is not available locally from the server. Tiemann does not disclose determining whether the static and dynamic contents are user control or determining whether the static or dynamic contents support output caching. Furthermore, Tiemann does not provide a reason to modify the server to determine whether content supports output caching. The server in Tiemann is not associated with an output cache and does not care whether content is cached.

Tso does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann. Tso also does not disclose or suggest determining whether each object referenced by the page object corresponds to a user control; and determining whether each user control supports output caching. Rather, Tso merely discloses a server 34 having a cache memory 30 in which content from a network 18 can be stored. See column 5, lines 6-11. When a request for an object is received from the client, a parser 22 of the server 34 attempts to retrieve the requested object from the cache 30. See column 6, lines 21-26. If the requested object is not found, then the object is retrieved from the network 18. See column 6, lines 26-30.

For at least these reasons, Tiemann would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 1, even in view of Tso. Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-13 is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 recites, in part, determining whether any objects referenced by the page object correspond with a user control that supports output caching; and caching the object in the output cache if the object corresponds with a user control that supports output caching.

In contrast, Tiemann and Tso fail to disclose or suggest determining whether any objects referenced by the page object correspond with a user control that supports output caching. As discussed above, neither Tiemann nor Tso distinguish between objects that support output caching and objects that do not support output caching.

Therefore, the combination of Tiemann and Tso would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 14 for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 15-26 depend from claim 14 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 14-26 is respectfully requested.

Claim 27 recites, in part, determining whether any dynamic components correspond to user controls that support output caching; and creating at the server computing system each of the dynamic components by processing each dynamic component corresponding to a user control including retrieving the executable code from the file and instantiating the retrieved executable code, and by processing each dynamic component that does not correspond to a user control.

In contrast, Tiemann and Tso fail to disclose or suggest determining whether any dynamic components correspond to user controls that support output caching. As discussed above, neither Tiemann nor Tso distinguish between objects that support output caching and objects that do not support output caching.

Therefore, the combination of Tiemann and Tso would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 27 for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 27 is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-9 and 19-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) under the combination of Tiemann and Tso in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,844 to Schloss et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Schloss does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann and Tso. Schloss also fails to disclose or suggest determining whether each object referenced by the page object corresponds to a user control; and determining whether each user control supports output caching.

For at least these reasons, the combination of Tiemann and Tso would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 6-9, even in view of Schloss. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 6-9 is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-22 depend from claim 14 and are allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 14. Schloss does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 6-9.

For at least these reasons, the combination of Tiemann and Tso would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 19-22, even in view of Schloss. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 19-22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 23, 24, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) under the combination of Tiemann, Tso, and Schloss in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,992 to Mattson. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 10, 11, and 13 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Schloss does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 6-9. Mattson also fails to overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann, Tso, and Schloss. Mattson does not disclose or suggest determining whether each object referenced by the page object corresponds to a user control; and determining whether each user control supports output caching.

For at least these reasons, the combination of Tiemann and Tso would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 10, 11, and 13, even in view of Schloss and Mattson. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 10, 11, and 13 is respectfully requested.

Claims 23, 24, and 26 depend from claim 14 and are allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 14. Schloss does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 19-22. Mattson also fails to overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann, Tso, and Schloss for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 10, 11, and 13.

For at least these reasons, the combination of Tiemann and Tso would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 23, 24, and 26, even in view of Schloss and Mattson. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 23, 24, and 26 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) under the combination of Tiemann, Tso, and Schloss in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,600 to Smith et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Schloss does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 6-9. Smith also fails to overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann, Tso, and Schloss. Smith does not disclose or suggest determining whether each object referenced by the page object corresponds to a user control; and determining whether each user control supports output caching.

Reply to Office Action of April 13, 2007

For at least these reasons, the combination of Tiemann and Tso would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 12, even in view of Schloss and Smith. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claim 25 depends from claim 14 and is allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 14. Schloss does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 19-22. Smith also fails to overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann, Tso, and Schloss for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 12.

For at least these reasons, the combination of Tiemann and Tso would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 25, even in view of Schloss and Smith. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 25 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary. In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.



Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: June 13, 2007

/Robert A. Kalinsky/
Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No. 50,471
RAK/JKS:rlk